

## ARGUMENTATION OF THE APPLICANT RELATING TO STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES

The Examiner has responded that the claims 76-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-17 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,723,948.

In responding to this response, the Applicant has amended claim 90 to include the previously presented claim 77 in order to show the mechanical unit wherein a downstream gripper acting on the substrate fed from the first processing roller and the second processing roller is disposed at any one of a delivery roller, a transfer roller or a downstream arm (supported by PCT claim 4 and 19, page 17 line 17 and claim 29)

The dependent claims of record have been cancelled or amended appropriately for consistency with amended claim 90.

The Applicant therefore submits that the independent claim 90 now is sufficiently distinguished from the prior art of record to satisfy the conditions for patenting. The dependent claims inherit the limitations of the independent claim and are therefore similarly distinguished from the prior art of record for the reasons given. The advantages associated with the structural differences between prior art and the invention indicated above, provide sufficient justification for patenting. Positive review and passage to issuance is therefore respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

5

Respectfully submitted,

Ebe Hesterman,

The Inventor



---

12/10/2008

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle &amp; Becker

Patentanwälte

Postfach 10 37 62

D-70032 Stuttgart

Federal Republic of Germany

Telephone: ++49/711-24 89 38-0

Fax: ++49/711-24 89 38-99